UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,538	08/28/2003	Gary A. Diehl	ROC920030133US1	9039

7590 02/19/2009

Grant A. Johnson
IBM Corporation-Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901

EXAMINER	
CHRISTENSEN, SCOTT B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2444	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/650,538
Filing Date: August 28, 2003
Appellant(s): DIEHL ET AL.

Joan Pennington
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 11/26/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 6/26/2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

7,088,689	LEE	8-2006
6,263,370	KIRCHNER	7-2001
6,289,001	SMYK	9-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in US Patent number 7,088,689 B2, hereafter referred to as "Lee" in view of Kirchner et al in US Patent number 6,263,370 B1, hereafter referred to as "Kirchner," and Smyk in US Patent number 6,289,001 B1, hereafter referred to as "Smyk."

With regard to claim 1, Lee discloses a method for implementing proxy Address Resolution for Virtual Internet Protocol addresses comprising the steps of:

identifying a Virtual Internet Protocol interface requiring proxy ARP (Lee: Column 2, lines 19-26. If data is transferred between two VLANs (VLANs have virtual IP addresses associated with the nodes), then a Virtual Internet Protocol interface requiring proxy ARP is identified);

dynamically selecting a proxy agent for said Virtual Internet Protocol interface (Lee: Column 2, lines 45-54), adding an IP address for said Virtual Internet Protocol

interface to an address list of an associated physical adapter for said selected proxy agent (Lee: Column 3, lines 34-41);

and utilizing said associated physical adapter for said selected proxy agent and broadcasting said added IP address for said Virtual Internet Protocol interface with a media access control address of said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent (Lee: Column 2, lines 45-53. The ARP request packet contains both the IP address, which is a Virtual IP address in this case, and the MAC address. This packet is broadcast to all nodes in the local subnet.).

Lee does not disclose expressly that the proxy agent and Virtual Internet protocol interface are in a same subnet. Lee also does not disclose expressly that responsive to failure of said selected proxy agent, dynamically selecting a new proxy agent is for said Virtual Internet protocol interface by TCP/IP code. Lee also does not disclose expressly the step of dynamically selecting said proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface includes providing TCP/IP code for dynamically selecting said proxy agent. Finally, Lee does not disclose expressly the same subnet being identified by a portion of a Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) Internet address.

It is noted that subnet is not explicitly defined in the applicant's specification. Therefore, the term subnet may be interpreted as being a subnet as defined by RFC 917, "Internet Standard Subnetting Procedure," by Jeffrey Mogul in October of 1984, hereafter referred to as "RFC917." Therefore a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to have the proxy agent and Virtual Internet protocol interface in the same subnet.

Evidence of this can be found in RFC917. RFC917 discloses that a subnet is a logically visible sub-section of a single Internet network. This allows an organization to have a single connection to the Internet with one IP address for their entire network (RFC917: Page 1, Overview). When applied to Lee, all the components in the invention of Lee would be in the same subnet, as a single organization would likely be implementing the invention within their network. This would further have the same subnet being identified by a portion of the Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) Internet address (RFC917: Pages 5-7, Section 2 and the figure on page 5).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the proxy agent and Virtual Internet protocol interface in the same subnet.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that organizations using subnets can use one number for several networks (RFC917: Overview). By implementing Lee's system on a single subnet, the nodes of the network would have a more direct communication line with each other, but still have access to the Internet.

Kirchner discloses using a TCP/IP interface for a client-server interface, where the server acts as a proxy (Kirchner: Column 10, lines 22-43). If TCP/IP were used with Lee, any selection would involve code written to conform to the TCP/IP standard.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine TCP/IP of Kirchner with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that TCP/IP was a very well known protocol, used in many networks and the Internet. By using TCP/IP, the proxy Address Resolution protocol would be compatible with more networks.

Smyk discloses a proxy agent selector that identifies alternate proxy agents should one or more of the other proxy agents fail and selects one or more alternate proxy agents (Smyk: Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the proxy selector of Smyk with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee as modified by Kirchner.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow proxy signaling to continue undisturbed in case of a failure (Smyk: Abstract).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to check for a proxy agent in the same subnet as said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to check for a proxy agent in the same subnet as said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the instant claim does not require that only the subnet is checked for a proxy agent. Therefore, a method that searches both in the same subnet and outside the subnet would meet this claim limitation. It is noted that Lee does not explicitly state that the subnet that the interface resides in is not searched. By checking within the same subnet, a proxy agent that is closer to the interface could possibly be found, thereby reducing the overall delay in communications and the burden on the network as a whole.

With regard to claim 2, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches identifying a broadcast ARP response for said Virtual Internet protocol interface (Lee: Abstract. The term "input/output processor response handler task" seems to simply identify the means that are utilized to identify a broadcast ARP response. Also, since a response occurs, it must have been identified), and continuing activation for said Virtual Internet protocol interface including enqueuing said Virtual Internet protocol interface to a proxy list of said selected proxy agents (Lee: Column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 12).

With regard to claim 3, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches setting an associated local IP address of said selected proxy agent in said Virtual Internet protocol interface (This limitation is inherently present. The agent needs to have a local IP address in order to receive any packets, so the address must be set. "To complete activation for said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface," as recited in claim 15, is interpreted as intended use, and is not given weight).

With regard to claim 4, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches that the step of dynamically selecting said proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface includes providing TCP/IP code for dynamically selecting said proxy agent (Kirchner: Column 10, lines 22-43. When Kirchner is combined with Lee, as in the rejection of claim 1 above, the communications would be performed through TCP/IP, meaning code

involving TCP/IP would be utilized to find and assign the proxy agent. Thus, TCP/IP code is provided for dynamically selecting said proxy agent.).

With regard to claim 7, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches that the step of dynamically selecting said proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface includes answering ARP requests for Virtual Internet protocol addresses (Lee: Abstract) with Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol code for said selected proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface (Kirchner: Column 10, lines 22-43. As the combination of references as applied to claim 1 above uses TCP/IP, any response to a message would involve TCP/IP messages, which would be in a code conforming to TCP/IP.).

With regard to claim 8, Lee discloses an apparatus for implementing proxy Address Resolution Protocol for Virtual Internet protocol addresses comprising:

a local network (Lee: Fig. 2, VLAN 1 and VLAN 2. Virtual Local Area Networks are interpreted as being similar to the local network as specified in the claim);

a server computer having a Virtual Internet protocol code for dynamically selecting a proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface (Lee: Column 2, lines 45-54);

code for dynamically selecting a proxy agent for said Virtual internet protocol interface (Lee: Column 2, lines 45-54);

and a proxy ARP (Lee: Abstract) for Virtual AP interface initiation task for adding an IP address for said Virtual Internet protocol interface to an address list of an associated one of said physical adapters for said selected proxy agent (Lee: Column 3, lines 34-41) and for utilizing said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent for broadcasting said added IP address for said Virtual Internet protocol interface with a media access control address of said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent (Lee: Column 2, lines 45-53. The ARP request packet contains both the IP address, which is a Virtual IP address in this case, and the MAC address. This packet is broadcast to all nodes in the local subnet.).

Lee does not disclose expressly that the code for selecting a proxy agent is within the TCP/IP standard. Lee also does not disclose expressly that responsive to failure of said selected proxy agent, dynamically selecting a new proxy agent is for said Virtual Internet protocol interface by TCP/IP code. Lee also does not disclose expressly the step of dynamically selecting said proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface includes providing TCP/IP code for dynamically selecting said proxy agent and the same subnet being identified by a portion of the Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) Internet address.

Kirchner discloses using a TCP/IP interface for a client-server interface, where the server acts as a proxy (Kirchner: Column 10, lines 22-43).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine TCP/IP of Kirchner with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that TCP/IP was a very well known protocol, used in many networks and the Internet. By using TCP/IP, the proxy Address Resolution protocol would be compatible with more networks.

Kirchner discloses using a TCP/IP interface for a client-server interface, where the server acts as a proxy (Kirchner: Column 10, lines 22-43). If TCP/IP were used with Lee, any selection would involve code written to conform to the TCP/IP standard.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine TCP/IP of Kirchner with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that TCP/IP was a very well known protocol, used in many networks and the Internet. By using TCP/IP, the proxy Address Resolution protocol would be compatible with more networks.

Smyk discloses a proxy agent selector that identifies alternate proxy agents should one or more of the other proxy agents fail and selects one or more alternate proxy agents (Smyk: Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the proxy selector of Smyk with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee as modified by Kirchner.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow proxy signaling to continue undisturbed in case of a failure (Smyk: Abstract).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to check for a proxy agent in the same subnet as said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface, as shown in RFC917 (RFC917: Overview). This would further have the same subnet being

identified by a portion of the Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) Internet address (RFC917: Pages 5-7, Section 2 and the figure on page 5).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to check for a proxy agent in the same subnet as said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the instant claim does not require that only the subnet is checked for a proxy agent. Therefore, a method that searches both in the same subnet and outside the subnet would meet this claim limitation. It is noted that Lee does not explicitly state that the subnet that the interface resides in is not searched. By checking within the same subnet, a proxy agent that is closer to the interface could possibly be found, thereby reducing the overall delay in communications and the burden on the network as a whole.

With regard to claim 9, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches the invention as substantially claimed except that the TCP/IP code is responsive to a failure of said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent, for dynamically selecting a new proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface.

Smyk discloses a proxy agent selector that identifies alternate proxy agents should one or more of the other proxy agents fail and selects one or more alternate proxy agents (Smyk: Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the proxy selector of Smyk with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee as modified by Kirchner.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow proxy signaling to continue undisturbed in case of a failure (Smyk: Abstract).

With regard to claim 10, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches that the TCP/IP code answers ARP requests to said Virtual Internet protocol address (Lee: Abstract), said ARP requests being provided without a parameter defining an associated local interface being specified with said ARP requests to said Virtual Internet protocol address (Lee: Column 4, lines 13-26. The virtual ARP request does not identify the local interface that the ARP request is actually for, but rather identifies the proxy ARP server.).

With regard to claim 11, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches an input/output processor response handler task for identifying a broadcast ARP response for said Virtual Internet protocol interface (Lee: Abstract. The term "input/output processor response handler task" seems to simply identify the means that are utilized to identify a broadcast ARP response. Also, since a response occurs, it must have been identified), and for continuing activation for said Virtual Internet protocol interface including enqueuing said Virtual Internet protocol interface to a proxy list of said selected proxy agent (Lee: Column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 12).

With regard to claim 12, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches that the IOP response handler task is adapted for setting an associated local IP address of said

selected proxy agent in said Virtual Internet protocol interface to complete activation for said Virtual Internet protocol interface (Lee: Column 3, lines 34 to 47. As the IP address is stored in the memory, the IP address associated with the given MAC address was set, at least in the memory. When the memory is set with the IP address, for all purposes, activation of the Virtual IP interface is completed, at least with respect to the server).

With regard to claims 13-17, the invention claimed is substantially similar to that claimed in claims 1-4 and 9, respectively, and are rejected for substantially similar reasons.

With regard to claim 18, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches that the TCP/IP code (Since the code running the program is written to utilize TCP/IP, it is interpreted as being TCP/IP code) utilizes said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent for answering ARP requests to said Virtual Internet protocol address (Lee: Abstract. As the proxy ARP server (or agent) sends a packet in response to receiving the ARP request packet, the response must utilize the physical adapter of the agent in order to reach the network.), said ARP requests being provided without a parameter defining an associated local interface being specified with said ARP requests to said Virtual Internet protocol address (Lee: Column 4, lines 13-26. The virtual ARP request does not identify the local interface that the ARP request is actually for, but rather identifies the proxy ARP server.).

(10) Response to Argument

Issue 1: On page 16 of the Appeal Brief, Appellant argues that "Lee does not show or suggest identifying a Virtual Internet Protocol (IP) interface requiring proxy ARP, as taught and claimed by Applicants."

The instant limitation only requires that a Virtual Internet Protocol interface is identified, where the identified interface requires proxy ARP. In the case of Lee, a proxy ARP server is provided (Lee: Figure 3, 10a). This server, as shown in Figure 3 of Lee, provides services to the source host and the destination host, meaning that these two hosts required the services of the Proxy ARP Server. Accordingly, these two hosts are identified.

The instant claim provides no requirement as to how the interface requiring proxy ARP is identified, nor does the instant specification provide any disclosure that serves to limit how the identification is performed. The disclosure for this claim limitation is found in Figure 2, block 202 and page 6, lines 19-30 of the instant specification. The specification merely states "Checking to determine if Virtual IP requiring proxy ARP is enabled as indicated in a decision block 202." The passage in the specification has provides no real detail as to how this checking is performed. Even if the passage did provide detail as to how the checking is performed, the claim utilizes the term "identifying," which would indicate a different scope than what is disclosed in the specification. In fact, the true recitation of the step of identifying a Virtual IP interface requiring proxy ARP is in the summary of the invention, page 3, lines 26-28, where the claim language is utilized to summarize the invention.

Appellant further argues details from the specification, where a Yes/No option is presented when a Virtual IP interface is configured. However, this Yes/No option is neither presented in the claim with regard to the instant limitation or in the specification with regard to the checking if the Virtual IP interface requires proxy ARP, as in figure 2, 202 and page 6, lines 19-30 of the instant specification. Accordingly, the disclosure of the Yes/No option (Specification: Page 5, lines 19-32) appears to only be a consideration for the initial configuration of the proxy ARP interface, which allows the interface to support the existing configurations until such a time as the option is changed to "Yes." Therefore, this passage has no clear impact on the scope of the language, "identifying a Virtual Internet Protocol (IP) interface requiring proxy ARP."

Accordingly, the step of identifying a Virtual Internet Protocol (IP) interface requiring proxy ARP must be accorded the broadest reasonable interpretation from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art, which is simply that a virtual IP interface requiring proxy ARP is identified, whether the identification is an active process (e.g. specifically checking to find an interface that requires proxy ARP) or a passive process (e.g. utilizing a message as an implied requirement for proxy ARP).

Issue 2: On pages 16-17, Appellant argues that "Lee, Kirchner, and Smyk do not teach or suggest dynamically selecting a proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface; said selected proxy agent and said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface being in a same subnet; adding an IP address for said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface to an address list of an associated physical adapter for said selected proxy

agent; and utilizing said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent, and broadcasting said added IP address for said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface with a media access control (MAC) address of said associated physical adapter for said selected proxy agent, as taught by Applicants and recited in independent claim 1." However, absolutely no detail appears to be provided with respect to this argument.

It is noted that the instant specification does not provide any specific detail on what constitutes an agent, and merely discloses that an agent is selected in some manner (Specification: Page 6, lines 19-30). Accordingly, the term “agent” may be interpreted as being an entity that performs a function for another entity. The exact function that is performed, according to the instant specification, is to answer the incoming ARP requests on behalf of the proxy client, where the agent is the interface (Specification, Page 5, line 32 to page 6, line 10). Therefor, the language, “dynamically selecting a proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface” merely requires that an interface is selected to act as the Virtual Internet protocol interface. Further, there is no requirement as to how the selection is performed. Accordingly, almost if a virtual IP interface is utilized, there must be some selection of a proxy agent. This selection can be considered to be dynamic if the proxy agent is not static, that is, if the proxy agent is not set for all incoming messages at all times. Lee is directed towards proper routing of packets in a VLAN, where a router determines where a packet should go based on the current ARP table (Lee: Column 3, line 53 to column 4, line 34). Accordingly, an interface, or agent, is dynamically selected to act on incoming messages.

With regard to the language, “said selected proxy agent and said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface being in a same subnet,” this limitation was addressed on pages 3-4 of the Final Office action mailed 6/26/2008, where the well known nature of subnets was pointed out, and motivation was provided to show how it would have been obvious to have these components on the same subnet. Further, upon further review, Lee discloses that the VLAN of Lee is constructed with one IP subnet, meaning that all of the interfaces of Lee are part of that one subnet (Lee: Column 1, lines 7-12). Further, this limitation only discusses the location of the components, but does not impart any functionality or positively recite any step to ensure that the components are on the same subnet. Accordingly, even if the references did not disclose that the components are on the same subnet, lacking a disclosure to the contrary, it is clear that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to perform this mere rearrangement of components.

With regard to the language, “adding an IP address for said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface to an address list of an associated physical adapter for said selected proxy agent,” Lee clearly discloses that the addresses are stored in an ARP cache in each IP host (Lee: Column 3, lines 34-41). Further, there is no real requirement in the instant claim as to where the list is located, only that the list is somehow for the selected proxy agent, and is somehow of a physical adapter that is somehow associated with the interface. The term "associated" only requires that the adapter has some relationship to the interface, whether the interface is specifically

bound to the physical adapter, or if the interface merely has a connection to the physical adapter.

With regard to the limitation, “broadcasting said added IP address for said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface with a media access control (MAC) address of said associated physical adapter for said selected proxy agent,” this limitation is clearly shown in Lee, column 2, lines 45-53.

Issue 3: On page 17, Appellant argues that references do not teach "responsive to a failure of the selected proxy agent, dynamically selecting a new proxy agent for the Virtual Internet protocol interface by TCP/IP code." It is noted that Appellant provides no further detail with respect to this argument.

First, it is noted that this limitation is "responsive to a failure of the selected proxy agent," where the instant claim does not require that a failure of the selected proxy agent occurs. Accordingly, lacking a requirement that a failure occurs, this limitation does not need to be disclosed or taught to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention.

Further, as in the rejection of claim 1, Smyk is specifically directed towards failover of proxy agents, where if one agent fails, another is selected. The concept of failover, in general, was very well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art, where if a node fails, any functionality associated with that node would be switched to a different node, which is what the instant claim requires as far as the dynamically selecting a new proxy agent portion of the cited language.

As for the language, “by TCP/IP code,” this limitation is interpreted as requiring that the code be compatible with TCP/IP, which is met if the code in any way utilizes with TCP/IP. Accordingly, in the proposed combination, the code that performs this functionality would be TCP/IP code, as the programming utilizes TCP/IP to perform the communication functions.

Issue 4: On pages 19-21, Appellant argues that the combination of references "do not provide any remote suggestion that same subnet being identified by a portion of Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) Internet address.”

However, as pointed out by Appellant on page 20 of the Appeal Brief, a subnet in TCP/IP is a part of a network that is identified by a portion of the Internet address. Accordingly, any node on the same subnet would be identified by a portion of the TCP/IP address, as the portion of the TCP/IP address would be the same. As addressed in Issue 2, subnets were very well known in the art, even to the degree that Appellant was able to rely on the IBM Dictionary of Computing, which was properly addressed in the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103, where the concept of subnets, and having the components on the same subnet, were very well known in the art. Further, as addressed above, Lee discloses that the components are located on one subnet. None of the cited reference have any disclosure that the term "subnet" should be interpreted in any fashion inconsistent with the well known meaning of the term "subnet," meaning that the same definition which is applied by Appellant can be applied to the term as in the prior art.

Lacking any further argument besides that "Only Applicants teach that said same subnet being identified by a portion of a Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) Internet address," which is clearly spurious, as Appellant's reliance on the IBM Dictionary of Computing contradicts this statement, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103 should be maintained.

Issue 5: On pages 22-23, Appellant broadly asserts that the combination of Lee, Kirchner, and Smyk do not teach or suggest "identifying a broadcast ARP response for said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface, and continuing activation for said Internet protocol (IP) interface to a proxy list of said selected proxy agent."

However, this limitation was addressed in the rejection of claim 2 as being disclosed in Lee. Lacking any detail with regard to this argument, the rejection of claim 2, above, is relied upon.

Issue 6: On pages 23-24, Appellant argues the rejection of claim 8. However, the arguments presented are substantially similar to those presented with respect to claim 1. Thus, the arguments presented with respect to issues 1-4 apply equally to these arguments.

Issue 7: On pages 25-26, Appellant argues the rejection of claim 13. However, the arguments presented are substantially similar to those presented with respect to claim

1. Thus, the arguments presented with respect to issues 1-4 apply equally to these arguments.

Issue 8: On pages 23-24, Appellant argues the rejection of claim 15. However, the arguments presented are substantially similar to those presented with respect to claim 1. Thus, the arguments presented with respect to issues 1-4 apply equally to these arguments.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/S. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 2444

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444

Conferees:

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444